

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated August 4, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner is apparently questioning support for the claimed changing features of the radiophone. This processing is described on at least pages 12, line 21 – page 14, line 3 and in Figure 6. Absent and identification of specific claim language that is considered indefinite, Applicant submits that claim 8 is definite and supported by the specification.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sennett in view Busey in further view of Rignell. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 8, as amended, recites two modes of operation, a troubleshooting mode and a programming mode. With respect to the programming mode, claim 8 has been amended to recite “the changing features of the radio telephone including: receiving an equipment manufacturer from a user input; receiving an equipment model from a user input; providing a list of programmable features for the model to the user; receiving a selected programmable feature from a user input; programming the radiotelephone with the selected programmable feature in response to a user input.” Support for this processing is found at least in Figure 6 and the accompanying description.

The combination of Sennett, Busey and Rignell fails to teach or suggest at least the elements of claim 8 directed to changing features of the radiotelephone. Rignell was relied upon for disclosing programming features of the radio telephone. Rignell broadly references automatically programming settings, parameters, etc. of a mobile unit, but does not teach the processing recited in claim 8 related to the programming of the radiotelephone features. Thus, the combination of Sennett, Busey and Rignell fails to teach the elements of claim 8.

For at least the above reasons, claim 8 is patentable over Sennett, Busey and Rignell. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9 depend from claim 8 and are patentable over Sennett, Busey and Dusse for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 8.

Claims 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sennett in view Busey, Rignell and Linyard. Linyard was relied upon for allegedly disclosing a video file being used in an information assistance system. Linyard, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Sennett in view Busey, Rignell discussed above with reference to claim 8. Claims 4-5 depend from claim 8 and are patentable over Sennett in view Busey, Rignell and Linyard for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 8.

Claims 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sennett in view Busey, Rignell and Beck or Evans. Beck or Evans were relied upon for allegedly disclosing a video file being used in an information assistance system. Beck or Evans, however, fail to cure the deficiencies of Sennett in view Busey, Rignell discussed above with reference to claim 8. Claims 4-5 depend from claim 8 and are patentable over Sennett in view Busey, Rignell and Beck or Evans for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 8.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: December 5, 2005